Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/659,259	ONO, MOTOTSUGU	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sean E. Conley	1744	

All Participants:

(1) *Sean E. Conley*.

(2) *Ed Wise*.

Status of Application: *Non-Final*

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: *22 May 2007*

Time: *10:00am*

Type of Interview:
- ☐ Telephonic
- ☐ Video Conference
- ☒ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☒ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
Fisher in view of Dion-Biro

Claims discussed:
1

Prior art documents discussed:
Fisher (U.S. Patent No. 6,003,787) and Dion-Biro (U.S. Patent No. 2,808,080)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed the combination of Fisher and Dion-Biro and the applicant's claimed limitation of "the spray gun, the end nozzle and the gas hose are set to have dimensions that permit a feed rate of the gas that does not cause said carbon dioxide gas to freeze due to decompressing in the pressure reducing valve during continuous spray for at least 15 minutes". The applicant argued that the pressure reducing valve of Dion-Biro was not applicable to the device of Fisher since the device of Dion-Biro is operating in a different environment with a different structure for preventing freezing. This argument was found to be persuasive. However, pressure reducing valves on compressed gas cylinders are well known in the art and common in carbon dioxide gas cylinders. The examiner indicated that after receiving a response from the applicant a search would be conducted to find another reference teaching a pressure reducing valve to be combined with Fisher and thus meet the terms of the applicant's claims.